

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

# PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:  
JOHN W. CALDWELL  
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR  
PHILDELPHIA, PA 19103

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) **27 SEP 2005**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

UPNA-0030

International application No.

International filing date (day/month/year)

Priority date (day/month/year)

PCT/US04/41262

10 December 2004 (10.12.2004)

11 December 2003 (11.12.2003)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): B32B 9/00; D01F 9/12 A61B 19/00; A61M 25/00 and US Cl.: 428/408, 446; 423/447.1; 604/11, 19, 264; 128/898

Applicant

THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

## 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

Stephen J. Stein

Telephone No. 571-272-1700

*Jean Proctor*  
Paralegal Specialist

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/41262

**Box No. I Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/US04/41262

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 1-54 YES

Claims NONE NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims 1-54 YES

Claims NONE NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims 1-54 YES

Claims NONE NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-54 the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest (1) a probing tool comprising a nanotube at least partially coated with a biocompatible coating comprising silica capable of absorbing bioreactive molecules, (2) a probing system comprising a nanotube at least partially covered with a biocompatible coating comprising silica capable of absorbing bioreactive molecules, a microscope and micron-resolved mechanical control, (3) a probing method comprising partially coating a nanotube with a biocompatible coating comprising silica to form a bio functional nanoprobe and contacting a vesicle with the probe, and (4) a probing method comprising partially coating a nanotube with a biocompatible coating comprising silica to form a bio functional nanoprobe, absorbing the coating with a bioreactive molecule, contacting the a vesicle with the nanoprobe, and expelling the molecule from the coating.

Claims 1-54 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/41262

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claim 19 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under PCT Article 6 because claim 19 is indefinite for the following reason(s): Claim 19 recites the limitation "The system of claim 11 wherein said silica is spherical colloidal silica particles". The limitation silica lacks antecedent basis in the claim.